

### **REMARKS**

The Office Action dated January 11, 2008 has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the specification and claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claim 25 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Claims 26-60 have been added. Claims 1-24 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been added. Therefore, claims 25-60 are currently pending in the application and are respectfully submitted for consideration.

The Office Action rejected claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Office Action alleged that the claims contain subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Specifically, the Office Action alleged that the limitation “computer readable medium” constitutes new matter. (see Office Action at page 3). The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that the original disclosure of the specification, at the time the application was filed, disclosed that the invention with reference to a non-limiting embodiment, is described in relation to SIP signaling in a 3G IMS mobile communication network. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would know and

understand that the steps recited in claim 25 could be performed by computer code embodied on a computer-readable medium when run on a computer. Therefore, Applicants submit that the original disclosure of the specification, at the time the application was filed, provided support for the limitation “computer readable medium,” and that said limitation does not constitute new matter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 4-13, and 16-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable as obvious over Schuster, *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,577,622) (“Schuster”) in view of Henrikson, *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,870,916) (“Henrikson”). The Office Action took the position that Schuster discloses all the elements of the claims with the exception of “allocating by means of the server a network address identifying a resource capable of sustaining the conference call,” “transmitting from the server to the first terminal a second message and a third message comprising the network address identifying the resource capable of sustaining the conference call,” with respect to claims 1, 24, and 25, and similar limitations with respect to claim 12. The Office Action then cited Henrikson as allegedly curing the deficiencies of Schuster. (See Office Action at pages 4-8). The rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 25, upon which claims 26-32 are dependent, recites a computer readable medium encoded with a computer code for performing a method when run on a computer. The method includes transmitting from a first terminal to a conference server a first message comprising a request for a resource capable of sustaining a conference

call, and receiving by the first terminal from the server a second message comprising a network address identifying a resource capable of sustaining the conference call which has been allocated by the server. The method further includes transmitting from the first terminal to at least one other terminal a third message comprising the network address.

Claim 33, upon which claims 34-40 are dependent, recites a method, which includes transmitting from a first terminal to a conference server a first message comprising a request for a resource capable of sustaining a conference call, and receiving by the first terminal from the server a second message comprising a network address identifying a resource capable of sustaining the conference call which has been allocated by the server. The method further includes transmitting from the first terminal to at least one other terminal a third message comprising the network address.

Claim 41, upon which claims 42-48 are dependent, recites an apparatus, which includes a transmitter configured to transmit to a conference server a first message comprising a request for a resource capable of sustaining a conference call, and a receiver configured to receive from the conference server a second message comprising a network address identifying a resource capable of sustaining the conference call which has been allocated by the server. The transmitter is further configured to transmit to at least one terminal a third message comprising the network address.

Claim 49, upon which claims 50-52 are dependent, recites a computer readable medium encoded with a computer code for performing a method when run on a computer. The method includes receiving from a first terminal a first message

comprising a request for a resource capable of sustaining a conference call, and allocating a network address identifying a resource capable of sustaining the conference call. The method further includes transmitting to the first terminal a second message comprising the network address that identifies the resource capable of sustaining the conference call. The network address is a dynamically generated uniform resource identifier.

Claim 53, upon which claims 54-56 are dependent, recites a method, which includes receiving from a first terminal a first message comprising a request for a resource capable of sustaining a conference call, and allocating a network address identifying a resource capable of sustaining the conference call. The apparatus further includes transmitting to the first terminal a second message comprising the network address that identifies the resource capable of sustaining the conference call. The network address is a dynamically generated uniform resource identifier.

Claim 57, upon which claims 58-60 are dependent, recites an apparatus, which includes a receiver configured to receive from a first terminal a first message comprising a request for a resource capable of sustaining a conference call, and an allocation unit configured to allocate a network address identifying a resource capable of sustaining the conference call. The apparatus further includes a transmitter configured to transmit to the first terminal a second message comprising the network address that identifies the resource capable of sustaining the conference call. The network address is a dynamically generated uniform resource identifier.

The above described arrangement is advantageous in that it allows the user of the first terminal to obtain an allocated work address of a resource for a conference call. The user of the first terminal is then in control of this information and can determine when to send it to other terminals for setting up a conference call and which terminals to send it too. The decision as to who to send it to can be made by the user at the first terminal immediately prior to sending the allocated address to the other terminals.

As will be discussed below, the combination of Schuster and Henrikson fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of the claims, and therefore fails to provide the advantages and features discussed above.

Schuster is directed to a system and a method for using a portable information device. Schuster describes a number of examples of methods by which conference calls can be set up between three users. Schuster discloses three different embodiments, only one of which utilizes a conference server. (see Schuster at col. 22, line 41 – col. 23, line 16; Fig. 10a). According to the arrangement described and illustrated therein, a first terminal transmits an invite request to a conference server. The invite request instructs the conference server to transmit invite requests to other terminals for the conference call. The other terminals accept the invite by transmitting an ok message to the conference server. Data channels are then created between the terminals and the conference server. No data channels are created between any of the terminals. This is because the conference server has data channels to all the terminals participating in the conference call. (see Schuster at col. 22, line 41 – col. 23, line 16).

Hendrickson is directed to a multimedia communications system and conferencing arrangements. Specifically, Henrickson describes a system in which a conference establishment server receives from a first user a request for a conference, the request including details of the required conference such as participants, resources and rules. According to the arrangement described in Henrikson, a user of a first terminal sends a request to a conference establishment server including all information necessary for the conference call, preferably including a list of participants, an indication of resources desired for the call, and rules for the conference call. The conference establishment server determines resources for the conference call and availability of participants and subsequently reserves resources for the conference call. When a time for the conference call occurs, the server can initiate the conference call by establishing calls to the participants or alternatively, the participants can call into a conference bridge. (see Henrikson at Abstract, col. 1, line 66 – col. 2, line 15).

With respect to claims 1, 4-12, and 16-24, Applicants respectfully submit that said claims have been cancelled. With respect to claims 25-60, Applicants respectfully submit that Schuster and Henrikson, whether considered individually or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest, all of the elements of said claims. For example, the combination of Schuster and Henrikson fails to disclose, teach, or suggest, at least, “transmitting from the first terminal to at least one other terminal a third message comprising the network address,” as recited in claim 25, and similarly recited in claims

33 and 41; and “wherein the network address is a dynamically generated uniform resource identifier,” as recited in claim 49, and similarly recited in claims 53 and 57.

With respect to “a third message comprising the network address,” in the “Response to Arguments” section, the Office Action states that “Schuster discloses that an invite request instructs the conference server to transmit invite requests to the second and third data network telephones, [and thus], the third message is a message instruction, which sent using the conference server to the other terminals.” see Office Action at page 2). However it appears that the Office Action is using the same message disclosed in Schuster to represent the “first message,” and the “third message,” as recited in independent claims 25, 33, and 41. Specifically, the Office Action first cited col. 9, lines 20-28 of Schuster as disclosing the “first message.” (see Office Action at page 4). However, the first cited portion of Schuster merely describes the SIP INVITE message in the SIP protocol in general terms, and does not specifically refer to the embodiment illustrated in Figures 10a and 10b of Schuster. (see Schuster at col. 9, lines 20-28). Subsequently, the Office Action cited col. 22, lines 41-61 as disclosing the “third message.” (see Office Action at page 4). The subsequent cited portion of Schuster discloses that a first data network telephone 208 transmits an INVITE message to the conference server 710. (see Schuster at col. 22, lines 41-45). This is the same INVITE message that is described in general terms at col. 9, lines 20-28. Furthermore, the subsequent cited portion of Schuster discloses that the INVITE message instructs the conference server to transmit INVITE messages to the second and third data network

telephones 218, and 228. Thus, the instruction to the conference server is not a separate message, but instead, is part of the same message that the Office Action alleged discloses the “first message.” Furthermore, the subsequent INVITE messages sent by the conference server to the second and third data network telephones do not disclose “the third message,” because independent claims 25, 33, and 41 each recite that the third message is transmitted from the first terminal, and the conference server is not the first terminal.

Additionally, the INVITE message does not disclose the “third message,” because independent claims 25, 33, and 41, each recite that the third message comprises a “network address identifying a resource capable of sustaining the conference call.” There is no disclosure, or suggestion, in Schuster that the message from first data network telephone 208 to the conference server 710 contains a network address. The Office Action takes the position that the message from first data network telephone 208 to the conference server 710 inherently comprises a network address. (see Office Action at page 4). Applicants respectfully disagree that said message inherently comprises a network address. As described above, Schuster discloses that a first data network telephone 208 transmits an INVITE message to the conference server 710, and that the INVITE message instructs the conference server to transmit INVITE messages to the second and third data network telephones 218 and 228. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Schuster that the first data network telephone has any knowledge of second and third data network telephones 218 and 228. Thus, a reasonable interpretation of



Schuster is that the conference server 710, not the first data network telephone 208, retains the network address of second and third data network telephones 218 and 228. Thus, the first data network telephone 208, merely sends a message containing an instruction to send a message to second and third data network telephones 218 and 228, and the first data network telephone completely relies on the conference server 710 to obtain the network address information on its own. Thus, Applicants respectfully contend that there is no inherent network address in the message to the conference server 710, and thus, that Schuster fails to disclose a third message which includes network address identifying a resource capable of sustaining the conference call.

With respect to “wherein the network address is a dynamically generated uniform resource identifier,” Applicants respectfully submit that embodiments of the present invention provide, on demand from a first terminal, a conference resource with a dynamic address for ad hoc conferences. (see Specification at paragraphs 0028 and 0039). There is absolutely no disclosure or suggestion in Schuster that the conference server dynamically generates a uniform resource identifier as a network address.

Furthermore, Henrikson does not cure the deficiencies of Schuster, for at least the following reasons.

With respect to “a third message comprising the network address,” as described above, Henrikson discloses a system in which a conference establishment server receives from a first user a request for a conference, and the conference establishment server determines resources for the conference call and availability of participants and

subsequently reserves resources for the conference call. Thus, Henrikson discloses that messages comprising the network address of allocated conference call resources are sent from the conference server to each of the terminals rather than from a first terminal to at least one other terminal. As described above, this is in contrast to embodiments of the invention, where it is the first terminal that sends the “third message,” to at least another terminal, where the “third message” comprises a network address.

With respect to “wherein the network address is a dynamically generated uniform resource identifier,” similar to Schuster, there is absolutely no disclosure, or suggestion, that the conference server of Henrikson dynamically generates a uniform resource identifier as a network address. In contrast, according to embodiments of the invention, a conference resource with a dynamic address for ad hoc conferences is provided on demand from a first terminal. (see Specification at paragraphs 0028 and 0039).

Applicants further submit that there are other significant differences between the inventions disclosed in Schuster and Henrikson, and embodiments of the present invention, most of which have been previously articulated in prior Responses. For example, embodiments of the present invention involve the acquisition of a conference resource address by the first participant from a server in the network, on an as-needed basis, such that the first participant can initiate an unscheduled conference when desired (i.e. “on the fly”). The first participant is not expected to send the list of participants to the server. Additionally, the first participant is free to add participants to the conference as desired after receiving the conference resource address.

In contrast, in Henrikson, the conference establishment server receives the request for conference, with at least the list of possible participants. The conference server then coordinates with participants to find a common acceptable time, notifies the participants of the conference time, and reserves the conference resource for the scheduled conference time. Thus, Henrikson does not suggest the first participant's terminal transmitting, directly, the conference resource address, to the other participants' terminals for an impromptu conference. (see Henrikson at col. 2, lines 27-37; col. 8, lines 28-38). Likewise, Schuster discloses that the first participant is required to send a list of expected participants and their addresses to the conference server, and the conference is instructed to transmit the invite message to the other participants. (see Schuster at col. 23, lines 17-50; Figures 10A and 10B). Thus, Schuster also does not suggest the first participant's terminal transmitting directly the conference resource address to the participant's terminal. Instead, in both Henrikson, and Schuster, the conference server, not the first participant, is expected to transmit the conference invite message to the participants. Finally, neither Henrikson, nor Schuster disclose the participant directly inviting participants to an ongoing conference, as the list of expected participants is sent to the server before the start of the conference.

Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, the combination of Schuster and Henrikson fails to disclose, teach, or suggest, all of the elements of claims 25, 33, 41, 49, 53, and 47. For the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 26-32 depend upon claim 25. Claims 34-40 depend upon claim 33. Claims 42-48 depend upon claim 41. Claims 50-52 depend upon claim 49. Claims 54-46 depend upon claim 53. Claims 58-60 depend upon claim 57. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 26-32, 34-40, 42-48, 54-56, and 58-60 should be allowed for at least their dependence upon claims 24, 33, 41, 49, 53, and 57, respectively, and for the specific elements recited therein.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art references fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of the claimed invention. These distinctions are more than sufficient to render the claimed invention unanticipated and unobvious. It is therefore respectfully requested that all of claims 25-60 be allowed, and this application passed to issue

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicant's undersigned representative at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Majid AlBassam  
Registration No. 54,749

**Customer No. 32294**  
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP  
14<sup>TH</sup> Floor  
8000 Towers Crescent Drive  
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700  
Telephone: 703-720-7800  
Fax: 703-720-7802

KMM:dlh

Enclosures: Additional Claim Fee Transmittal  
Check No. 018546